Swift Creek Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Swift Creek Middle School

2100 PEDRICK RD, Tallahassee, FL 32317

https://www.leonschools.net/swiftcreek

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Swift Creek Middle School is to provide each student a diverse education in a safe, supportive environment that promotes self-awareness, creativity, motivation, and a love of learning. The SCMS team joins our parents and community in helping students develop life-long skills to become productive members of society who will succeed and contribute positively to our global community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Swift Creek Middle School exists to serve the whole-child through programs that account for the academic, physical, social, and emotional needs of all students. The staff at SCMS is committed to creating and fostering a structured, trusting, and caring environment that engages students to actively contribute to their educational growth.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Koerner, Jason	Principal	
Austin, Tina	Assistant Principal	
Stephens, Dea	Dean	

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The school leadership team reviews prior year school data to determine appropriate and manageable school goals for the upcoming school year. These goals are shared with our school improvement team, teachers, staff, parents, and our business and community members to determine the appropriateness of the goals and modify any of the goals, as needed. This process occurs through school meetings, school advisory council meetings, and a public hearing at the beginning of the school year.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Quarterly School Advisory Council meetings, which are published on our school website, are utilized to review progress monitoring data and the effectiveness of the strategies utilized for improvement. Our

School Advisory Council, which includes parents, teachers, staff, and business partners, have the opportunity to provide input on the effectiveness of our strategies and progress towards meeting goals.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	49%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	33%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	53	77	169
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	20	16	55
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	9	16
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4	13
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	58	62	165
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	51	41	147
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	49	59	153

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	33	26	91

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	5

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	53	77	169
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	20	16	55
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	9	16
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4	13
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	58	62	165
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	51	41	147
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	49	59	153

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	33	26	91

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	5

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	62	52	49	57	53	50	60		
ELA Learning Gains				53			54		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				32			35		
Math Achievement*	71	58	56	63	34	36	57		
Math Learning Gains				69			44		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				59			35		
Science Achievement*	64	51	49	59	55	53	61		
Social Studies Achievement*	84	75	68	81	61	58	79		
Middle School Acceleration	79	67	73	80	47	49	84		
Graduation Rate					51	49			
College and Career Acceleration					76	70			
ELP Progress		42	40		73	76			

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	72
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	360
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	553
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	45			
ELL	48			
AMI				
ASN	85			
BLK	56			
HSP	71			
MUL	78			
PAC				
WHT	78			
FRL	55			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	32	Yes	2	
ELL	51			
AMI				
ASN	83			
BLK	53			
HSP	55			
MUL	75			
PAC				
WHT	64			
FRL	50			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	62			71			64	84	79			
SWD	32			46			35	67			4	
ELL	42			54							2	
AMI												
ASN	73			83			94		89		4	
BLK	47			53			40	81	58		5	
HSP	66			73			63	80	75		5	
MUL	69			85			65	100	72		5	
PAC												
WHT	68			79			71	85	86		5	
FRL	44			57			44	75	53		5	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	57	53	32	63	69	59	59	81	80			
SWD	24	27	20	28	53	47	18	38				
ELL	33	35		65	71							
AMI												
ASN	72	60		87	83			100	95			
BLK	42	46	35	44	67	60	42	66	75			
HSP	54	43	21	62	67	56	48	82	60			
MUL	71	60		74	77		73	89	84			
PAC												
WHT	64	57	32	71	69	54	68	84	81			
FRL	40	43	29	46	64	61	39	63	62			

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	60	54	35	57	44	35	61	79	84			
SWD	27	38	26	23	42	31	32	54				
ELL	40	67	60	50	55							
AMI												
ASN	82	74		87	59		74	100	96			
BLK	46	44	30	35	33	32	43	62	71			
HSP	63	59	45	55	42	37	58	73	83			
MUL	69	63		61	47	55	44	92	93			
PAC												
WHT	65	55	39	65	49	37	70	87	85			
FRL	43	43	33	37	37	40	39	68	73			

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	59%	49%	10%	47%	12%
08	2023 - Spring	61%	49%	12%	47%	14%
06	2023 - Spring	60%	48%	12%	47%	13%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	69%	55%	14%	54%	15%
07	2023 - Spring	59%	51%	8%	48%	11%
08	2023 - Spring	77%	49%	28%	55%	22%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	45%	38%	7%	44%	1%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	95%	58%	37%	50%	45%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	58%	42%	48%	52%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	95%	65%	30%	63%	32%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	84%	72%	12%	66%	18%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Data from 2021-2022 suggests that students in the following subgroups perform below the school average in English/ Language Arts statewide testing- SWD, ELL, Black, Hispanic, and FRL. While these subgroups are below the schoolwide average, all showed an increase during the 2022-2023 school year.

Data from 2021-2022 suggests that students in the following subgroups perform below the school average in Science and Social Studies statewide testing- SWD, Black, Hispanic, and FRL. While these subgroups are below the schoolwide average, all showed an increase during the 2022-2023 school year.

Students have shown a continual increase in statewide testing performance since the initial decline caused by COVID-19 shutdowns. These increased scores can be attributed to additional resources allocated due to the break in instruction and learning loss factors.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

Across all state testing areas, SWD students showed the lowest performance, and growth, in all testing areas- ELA, Math, Science, and Social Studies. The largest gaps in achievement levels appears in Science and Social Studies achievement levels, compared to their peers.

SWD traditionally score lower than their peers, due to outside influences on their learning. The break in instruction that occurred over the past four years seems to have magnified the lack of learning progress achieved by students who receive additional support.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Across all state testing areas, SWD students showed the lowest performance, and growth, in all testing areas- ELA, Math, Science, and Social Studies. The largest gaps in achievement levels appears in Science and Social Studies achievement levels, compared to their peers.

SWD traditionally score lower than their peers, due to outside influences on their learning. The break in instruction that occurred over the past four years seems to have magnified the lack of learning progress achieved by students who receive additional support.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Swift Creek students showed the largest growth in Math achievement levels and all subcategories. An emphasis was placed, beginning in 2021-2022, with improving student Math scores with targeted interventions. These interventions were led by a dedicated Math interventionist, utilizing both push-in and pull- out intervention models.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Approximately 20% of the school population scored level 1 on ELA and Math in 2021-2022.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

1) Improve SWD performance in all categories.
2) Improve student performance in Science and Social Studies statewide testing.
3) Decrease students scoring a level 1 on statewide testing in ELA and Math.

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Student performance is directly correlated to their attendance and behavior. Although not easily visible in student performance, those that attend school regularly outperform students with excessive absences. Based on our EWS data, the number of students absent 10% of the school year or more is approximately the same number of students who scored level 1 on statewide testing in ELA and Math.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

The number of students absent 10% or more of the school year will decline by 10%.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

The school administrative team will review attendance data monthly and work with the school social worker, school counselor, admissions liaison, and MTSS/ Threat Assessment team to identify students with excessive absence and develop a plan to increase their school attendance and participation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tina Austin (austint@leonschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The school administrative team will review attendance data monthly and work with the school social worker, school counselor, admissions liaison, and MTSS/ Threat Assessment team to identify students with excessive absence and develop a plan to increase their school attendance and participation.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research-based effectiveness and availability of school resources.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 3 - Promising Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Identify students who meet excessive absence requirements.

Person Responsible: Tina Austin (austint@leonschools.net)

By When: Monthly

Communicate with school counselors, social worker, and MTSS/ Threat Assessment team to determine appropriate personalized interventions.

Person Responsible: Tina Austin (austint@leonschools.net)

By When: As needed, monthly

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

SWD performed below the school average in all categories, showing the largest gap between their performance and the schoolwide average.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

SWD performance on statewide testing will increase 5% in each category.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Reading and Math interventionists will collaborate with ESE caseworkers, along with administration, to review progress monitoring and determine necessary interventions to improve performance.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Julie Strickland (stricklandj@leonschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Inclusion model for ESE support services will be utilized in Reading and Math. Students will receive their academic support inside of their traditional classroom, provided by an ESE certified teacher. Reading and Math interventionist teachers will target additional instruction using a variety of research based strategies to improve reading and writing performance.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The FIN network has provided specific inclusion trainings that show improved academic performance in SWD.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

SWD will be grouped in core content areas based on the services and strands required for support and improvement.

Person Responsible: Jason Koerner (koernerj2@leonschools.net)

By When: Prior to the start of the school year.

SWD will be grouped in core content areas based on the services and strands required for support and improvement.

Person Responsible: Jason Koerner (koernerj2@leonschools.net)

By When: Prior to the start of the school year.

ESE teachers provide academic support based on student need, listed in IEP.

Person Responsible: Julie Strickland (stricklandj@leonschools.net)

By When: Throughout the school year

ESE teachers provide academic support based on student need, listed in IEP.

Person Responsible: Julie Strickland (stricklandj@leonschools.net)

By When: Throughout the school year

ESE teachers provide academic support based on student need, listed in IEP.

Person Responsible: Julie Strickland (stricklandj@leonschools.net)

By When: Throughout the school year

ESE teachers provide academic support based on student need, listed in IEP.

Person Responsible: Julie Strickland (stricklandj@leonschools.net)

By When: Throughout the school year.

Student data is reviewed and interventions modified based on progress monitoring performance.

Person Responsible: Julie Strickland (stricklandj@leonschools.net)

By When: Throughout the school year

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Schoolwide student performance in Science has declined over the past several years, both at the school and district levels.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Student performance in Science statewide testing will increase 5% from 2021-22.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Data will be reviewed by Science teachers, Reading Teacher, and administration to determine effectiveness of support implementation of Content Area Reading Strategies.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Danielle Burke (burked@leonschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Content Area Reading Strategies- 8th grade students who have traditionally scored level 1 on statewide testing will work with a Reading and Science teacher to develop reading and comprehension skills while utilizing Science curriculum.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

National data showing improvement of student performance.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

8th grade students who scored a level 1 on their most recent ELA statewide FAST assessment will be scheduled into a co-teacher model with a Science and Reading teacher,

Person Responsible: Jason Koerner (koernerj2@leonschools.net)

By When: Before the start of the 2023-2024 school year

The Reading and Science teacher will collaborate to develop a curriculum that utilizes research-based reading strategies within the Science content area.

Person Responsible: Danielle Burke (burked@leonschools.net)

By When: Throughout the school year

Implement reading strategies through Science curriculum.

Person Responsible: Danielle Burke (burked@leonschools.net)

By When: Throughout the school year

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

The School Advisory Council will review recommendations made by the administrative team that focus any school improvement allocation to the goals set forward by the school improvement plan.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No